

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006

| APPLICATION NO.                           | F                     | ILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/618,165                                | 09/618,165 07/17/2000 |               | Jae Beom Choi        | 8733.039.20           | 8415             |  |
| 30827                                     | 7590                  | 04/10/2006    |                      | EXAM                  | EXAMINER         |  |
|   |                       | & ALDRIDGE LL | BOUTSIKARI           | BOUTSIKARIS, LEONIDAS |                  |  |
| 1900 K STREET, NW<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20006 |                       |               |                      | ART UNIT              | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |                       |               |                      | 2872                  |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 1) | .0 |
|----|----|
| n  | 1  |

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|-----------------|--------------|
| 09/618,165      | CHOI ET AL.  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     |
|                 |              |

| Advisory Action   | 09/618,165 CHOI ET AL.  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief  | Examiner  | Art Unit   | ·  |
|   | Leo Boutsikaris   | 2872   | İ  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the o   | orrespondence add  | ress   |
| THE REPLY FILED 27 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP  |   |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>   | the same day as filing a Notice of<br>wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff<br>tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o<br>ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo                  | Appeal. To avoid abai<br>idavit, or other eviden<br>compliance with 37 CF                                      | rce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a)   | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing   | g date of the final rejection  | on.  |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp  | 06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da | 36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriatinally set in the final Office te of the final rejection, e | te extension fee<br>ate extension fee<br>ce action; or (2) as<br>even if timely filed, |
| filing the Notice of Appeal was filed on A blief in comp<br>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed<br><u>AMENDMENTS</u>  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the   |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further composed to the composed in | nsideration and/or search (see NO w);<br>tter form for appeal by materially re  | TE below);<br>ducing or simplifying t  |  |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   |   |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ul>   | :   |  |  |
| non-allowable claim(s).  7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)   | will not be entered, or b)      □ will  | -  | ·  |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov<br>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:<br>Claim(s) allowed:  | vided below or appended.  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  |   |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.  10. The affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.   | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear<br>y and was not earlier presented. So  | al and/or appellant fail<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1   | ls to provide a ).   |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  |   |  |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu  | t does tho i place the application if   | i condition for allowall   | ce pecause.  |
| <ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>  | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N   | lo(s).<br>Leonidas Bout<br>Primary exa   |  |
|   |   | Leo Boutsikaris, Ph.<br>Primary Patent Exar  | •  |

Continuation of 13. Other: Kubota does not teach away from using a polarizer holder that would absorb light. When Kubota says that the Ps component light illuminates the environment over a wide angle (lines 34-42, col. 3), he simply means that some of the light is spread/directed away from the incoming traffic direction. This does not necessarily imply that all this light can not be absorbed by the holder if it is incident thereupon.